

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on December 2, 2005, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 5, 9-11, 14, 17-18, 21-22, 26-28 are amended, and no claims are added or canceled; as a result, claims 1-28 are now pending in this application.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 18-19, 22-24 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitsuhashi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,369,905) in view of Hagiuda, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,225). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as set forth below.

The rejection states in part that “Mitsuhashi does not expressly combining each image with a printing device image to create a system image”. However, the Examiner asserts that “Hagiuda discloses combining each image with a printing device image to create a system image”. Further, at page 6, the office action cites Column 41, lines 49-52 and Figure 55 of the Hagiuda reference as describing “**a merge module** configured to combine the printer image with one or more external device images to form a system image”. From Applicant’s review of the Hagiuda reference, there is not a description, teaching, or suggestion in Column 41, lines 49-52 directed to **using a merge module to automatically combine** appropriate images **requested from** each of one or more external devices with a printing device image to create a coherent system image.

In contrast, Applicant’s independent claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

based on the event code, requesting an appropriate image from each of one or more external devices attached to a printing system;
using a merge module to automatically combine each image with a printing device image to create a coherent system image

Applicant’s independent claim 18, as amended, recites in part:

requesting an appropriate image from each of one or more external devices, each image being defined by the event code;
using a merge module to form a coherent system image by automatically combining each appropriate image and a printing device image

Applicant's independent claim 22, as amended, recites in part:

a merge module configured to:
automatically combine the printer image with one or more requested
external device images to form a coherent system image;

Applicant's independent claim 26, as amended, recites in part:

a merge module configured to:
request appropriate external images from each of one or more
external devices;
form a coherent system image by automatically combining a printer
image and an external image from each of the one or more external devices

Applicant's independent claim 27, as amended, now recites in part:

wherein the printing device comprises a merge module configured to:
request appropriate external device images;
retrieve the appropriate external device images;
automatically combine the external device images and the printing
device image into a coherent system image

Finally, Applicant's independent claim 28, as amended, recites in part:

wherein the printing device comprises a merge module configured to:
interpret an event code,
request appropriate external device images based on the event code;
automatically combine the appropriate external device images and
the printing device image into a coherent system image

As such, each and every element of independent claims 1, 18, 22 and 26-28, as amended, is not described, taught, or suggested in the Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda references, either independently or in combination. Moreover, the Hagiuda reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Mitsuhashi reference. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection for the above independent claims 1, 18, 22 and 26-28, as well as those claims which depend therefrom, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner states on pages 17-18 of the office action that arguments similar to those presented for claims 1 and 18 are equally applicable to claims 9 and 21, respectively.

For the reasons stated above, neither Mitsuhashi nor Hagiuda, either independently or in combination, describes, teaches, or suggests using a merge

module to automatically combine appropriate images requested from each of one or more external devices with a printing device image to create a coherent system image.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claim 9, as amended, recites in part:

based on the event code, requesting an appropriate image from each of one or more external devices attached to a printing system;
using a merge module to automatically combine each image with a printing device image to create a coherent system image

Also, Applicant's independent claim 21, as amended, recites in part:

requesting an appropriate image from each of one or more external devices, each image being defined by the event code;
using a merge module to form a coherent system image by automatically combining each appropriate image and a printing device image, the printing device image being defined by the event code

Since each and every element of independent claims 9 and 21, as amended, is not described, taught, or suggested in the Mitsuhashi or Hagiuda references, either independently or in combination, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection for the above independent claims 9 and 21.

Claims 6, 20, and 25 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitsuhashi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,369,905) in view of Hagiuda, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,225), and further in view of McCormick, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,706,411).

Claims 6, 20, and 25 depend from independent claims 1, 18, and 22, respectively, which, as amended, are now in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above in view of Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda. The McCormick reference does not cure the deficiencies of Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda with respect to independent claims 1, 18, and 22. That is, McCormick does not describe, teach or suggest **using a merge module to automatically combine** appropriate images requested from each of one or more external devices with a printing device image to create a coherent system image.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

based on the event code, requesting an appropriate image from each of one or more external devices attached to a printing system;

using a merge module to automatically combine each image with a printing device image to create a coherent system image

Applicant's independent claim 18, as amended, recites in part:

requesting an appropriate image from each of one or more external devices, each image being defined by the event code;
using a merge module to form a coherent system image by automatically combining each appropriate image and a printing device image

Applicant's independent claim 22, as amended, recites in part:

a merge module configured to:
automatically combine the printer image with one or more requested external device images to form a coherent system image;

As such, each and every element of independent claims 1, 18, and 22 is not described, taught, or suggested in Mitsuhashi, Hagiuda, and McCormick, either independently or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to claims 6, 20, and 25 which depend from independent claims 1, 18, and 22.

Claims 10, 13 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagiuda, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,225) in view of Mori, et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2005/0156869).

The Hagiuda reference appears to describe a network device control method and unit in which the same password is used for both starting up network management software and for acquiring information and making settings in a target network database, so the password entry can be omitted in order to improve the operability of the network management software. (column 2, lines 35-44). As the Examiner notes the Hagiuda reference does not provide a description, teaching or suggestion for "during the initializing, receiving images from the one or more external devices" as provided in independent claim 10.

The Mori reference, however, does not cure the deficiencies of the Hagiuda reference with respect to claim 10, as amended. The Mori reference appears to describe an image display control system for allowing the connection of various kinds of image displays to one supply source. (Abstract). Mori does not provide a

description, teaching, or suggestion for “during the initializing, receiving exterior images of one or more external devices from the one or more external devices” as provided in independent claim 10, as amended.

Since neither the Hagiuda reference nor the Mori reference, alone or in combination, describe, teach, or suggest each and every element recited in independent claim 10, as amended, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection for the above independent claim 10, as well as those claims which depend therefrom.

The Examiner states on pages 17-18 of the Office Action that arguments similar to those presented for claim 10 are equally applicable to claim 17. For the reasons stated above, neither Hagiuda nor Mori, either independently or in combination, describes, teaches, or suggests “during the initializing, receiving exterior images of one or more external devices from the one or more external devices” as provided in independent claim 17, as amended.

Since neither the Hagiuda reference nor the Mori reference, alone or in combination, describe, teach, or suggest each and every element recited in independent claim 17, as amended, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection for the above independent claim 17.

Claims 11, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagiuda, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,225) in view of Mori, et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2005/0156869), and further in view of Mitsuhashi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,369,905).

Claims 11, 14, and 15 depend from independent claim 10 which, as amended, is now in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above in view of Hagiuda and Mori. Mitsuhashi does not cure the deficiencies of Hagiuda and Mori with respect to independent claim 10. That is, Mitsuhashi does not describe, teach, or suggest “during the initializing, receiving exterior images of one or more external devices from the one or more external devices” as provided in independent claim 10, as amended. As such, each and every element of independent claim 10 is not described, taught, or suggested in Hagiuda, Mori, and Mitsuhashi, either independently or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests

reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to claims 11, 14, and 15 which depend from independent claim 10.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagiuda, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,225) in view of Mori, et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2005/0156869), and further in view of McCormick, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,706,411).

Claim 12 depends from independent claim 10 which, as amended, is now in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above in view of Hagiuda and Mori. McCormick does not cure the deficiencies of Hagiuda and Mori with respect to independent claim 10. That is, McCormick does not describe, teach, or suggest “during the initializing, receiving exterior images of one or more external devices from the one or more external devices” as provided in independent claim 10, as amended. As such, each and every element of independent claim 10 is not described, taught, or suggested in Hagiuda, Mori, and McCormick, either independently or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to claim 12 which depends from independent claim 10.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Gregg W. Wisdom at (360) 212-8052 to facilitate prosecution of this matter.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.


CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 27th day of February, 2006.

Alison L. Subendan
Name


Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
Fernando Bolanos

By his Representatives,
BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By: 
Edward J. Brooks III
Reg. No. 40,925

Date: 2/27/2006